

1                   IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2                   FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
3                   EASTERN DIVISION

4           IN RE:   NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION        ) No. 17-md-2804  
5           OPIATE LITIGATION NO. 2804            )  
6    )  
7           APPLIES TO ALL CASES                   ) Hon. Dan A. Polster  
8    )

9  
10                   HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO FURTHER  
11                   CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW

12                   VIDEO DEPOSITION OF CHRIS DYMON

13  
14                   January 25, 2019  
15                   9:09 a.m.

16  
17                   Reporter:  Jude Arndt, CSR, RPR  
18                   CSR No. 084-004847

**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





1     when you went for your yearly assessment in 2013,  
2     this -- whatever with work you did to support the top  
3     100, top 500 indexing system was one of your  
4     achievements that you helped with in 2013; correct?

5             A.     Correct, I assisted on it, yes.

6             Q.     And it was an important part of the  
7     overall let's try to make the RX Integrity program more  
8     robust; fair statement?

9             MS. DESH:   Objection.   Vague.

10            A.     To learn more, again.   It's just all about  
11     learning and learning what could we do.

12            Q.     (By Mr. Shkolnik)   And if we could turn to  
13     the next page.   Bates numbered 264.   In 264 we have a  
14     breakdown of the various phases of the SOM substance  
15     order logic for the program that was implemented prior  
16     to you beginning with the group in 2013.

17                    Have you ever seen any diagram similar to  
18     this that outlined the phases of the SOM system -- the  
19     CSOM system?

20            A.     I may have, but I really can't recall.

21            Q.     According to Phase 1, which according to  
22     this was implemented 2009 to 2010 -- I'm sorry, August  
23     of 2009 through September of 2010, the first phase of  
24     the CSOM process would be it would review all

1 controlled Walgreens DC orders, and it would flag  
2 orders -- and it says up on top, am I correct, flag  
3 select orders as suspicious? That's what the algorithm  
4 is saying, the logic; correct?

5 A. According to the information on this  
6 slide.

7 Q. And in fact, it says that this was  
8 actually prepared for litigation at the bottom,  
9 anticipation of litigation or at the direction of  
10 litigation and regulatory law. This was in preparation  
11 for the trial where they were going to -- where DEA was  
12 coming after Walgreens; correct?

13 A. I do not --

14 MS. DESH: Objection. Calls for  
15 speculation.

16 A. I do not know.

17 Q. (By Mr. Shkolnik) You knew that they were  
18 going -- that they were about to go to trial with the  
19 DEA when you started with Integrity; correct?

20 MS. DESH: Same objection.

21 Q. (By Mr. Shkolnik) In February of that  
22 year?

23 A. I know we were in contact with the DEA. I  
24 don't know if it ever went to a trial or anything like

1     that.

2             Q.     Well, it didn't go to trial; you guys  
3     settled. But you were aware that the team was gearing  
4     up for trial against the DEA over its suspicious order  
5     monitoring program? Were you aware of that?

6             MS. DESH: Same objection.

7             A.     Again, I don't know if our legal team was  
8     preparing for trial or not. I don't know.

9             Q.     (By Mr. Shkolnik) It would be a nice  
10    exhibit if they were going to trial, but that's a whole  
11    'nother issue.

12            And it says that the -- it flags select  
13    orders as suspicious, based on a 26-week pattern, and  
14    then the key point on what was done in that first year,  
15    August of 2009 to September of 2010, orders were not  
16    reduced if they were flagged as suspicious. That's  
17    what they're telling us; correct?

18            A.     According to the information on the slide,  
19    yes.

20            Q.     Did anyone ever tell you that there was a  
21    one-year period where this new SOM logic was being  
22    implemented where they were flagging orders as  
23    suspicious, were shipping them, and were not reducing  
24    them? Did anyone ever tell you that?

1           A.       Not that I can recall.

2           Q.       From your understanding, would it be  
3   appropriate if whatever the system in place was -- I'm  
4   not going to identify what logic it was or what  
5   algorithm. Was it your understanding that if the  
6   company flagged an order as suspicious, they were not  
7   supposed to order it -- I'm sorry, ship it?

8                   MS. DESH: Objection to the form.

9           A.       Again, looking at regs, potentially they  
10   may have not been able to ship it.

11          Q.       (By Mr. Shkolnik) So in the first year of  
12   this new algorithm or program, they were flagging, and  
13   they were not reducing, and they were shipping.

14                   So in the second phase, let's start from  
15   September 2010, and it says to current -- given the  
16   dates in this, some time in 2012 -- it says the orders  
17   were reviewed, they were flags based on drug by store,  
18   historical patterns of 26 weeks, but they had  
19   implemented in this Phase 2 that they would be reducing  
20   only WAG DC orders.

21                   So this would be saying they had a  
22   reduction in place if it exceeded -- if it was found to  
23   be suspicious, and if a WAG order -- that means a  
24   Walgreens DC order -- would be reduced and shipped;

1 correct?

2 A. Looks so, according to this document, yes.

3 Q. So then at this point they were saying  
4 Phase 3, it was estimated to be implemented some time  
5 in mid-2012, that it would check to see if an order was  
6 placed with a vendor after -- 48 hours after it was  
7 flagged.

8 So here it's saying it was flagged based  
9 on drug by store, historical pattern over 26 weeks. So  
10 that stayed the same; correct?

11 A. I don't know. I wasn't working on this at  
12 the time.

13 Q. But if we're just reading it, that's what  
14 it says? It's basically the same as the top two?

15 A. Based on this document, yes.

16 Q. And there was a discussion during that  
17 time frame to shorten the analysis period down to 13  
18 weeks. Irrespective of the wording of discussion, when  
19 you got involved in the RX Integrity, would I be  
20 correct that it was down to 13 weeks, the algorithm, or  
21 was it still 26 weeks?

22 A. I believe it was 13 or possibly even lower  
23 at the time. I can't exactly recall.

24 Q. What would be the significance of

1     shortening the period that the algorithm applies? How  
2     does that affect your -- the analysis in terms of  
3     observing changes and patterns?

4             A.     Again, I didn't design the algorithm. I  
5     would imagine it probably makes it easier to analyze a  
6     succinct piece of time easier.

7             Q.     Or it's harder to see a change if you're  
8     looking at a shorter period than you're looking at a  
9     longer period; isn't that also a possibility?

10            A.     I do not know. I'm not a statistician.

11            Q.     So here it's -- then it goes on to say  
12     what are the takeaways of it after it's been flagged as  
13     suspicious? Review and refinements of tolerance and  
14     frequency threshold, confirmed action for each possible  
15     scenario using a matrix.

16                    Now, then it goes on to say the Phase 4,  
17     which was going to be implemented sometime in 2012 --  
18     and basically it was saying that the algorithm for  
19     suspicious order monitoring would include both DC  
20     orders, WAG DC orders, and vendor orders, and flag any  
21     as suspicious if they exceed the threshold.

22                    When you came into SOM, was that procedure  
23     in place?

24            A.     I believe it was. It's hard to recall

1 exactly what changes were occurring, but I believe they  
2 were already starting that.

3 Q. Yeah, that was not a -- that was not a  
4 change implemented by the new team; that was already in  
5 the works before you guys -- you came in, wasn't it?

6 A. It probably was in the works, yes.

7 Q. And here it was saying both WAG DC,  
8 Walgreens distribution center, as well as the vendor  
9 orders were all reduced if they exceeded a threshold,  
10 and when you got on board, that was a process that was  
11 occurring in 2013; correct?

12 A. From what I recall, yes.

13 Q. When you joined the team, when an order  
14 had been reduced, either a WAG or vendor order, was a  
15 report being made to the DEA?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. As soon as it was reduced?

18 A. The same day when I was on the team, yes.

19 Q. So once a reduction occurs, the daily  
20 report would say an order came in, we reduced it, and  
21 DEA, you're on notice of this?

22 MS. DESH: Objection to the form.

23 A. Same as the templates we looked at  
24 earlier.

1 Q. (By Mr. Shkolnik) Would they -- would it  
2 be automatic, or would someone have to look at them  
3 first and determine that they're suspicious or not?

4 MS. DESH: Same objection. Calls for  
5 speculation.

6 A. I can't really recall. I know we were  
7 just starting to use a new dashboard and automation in  
8 various processes. I just can't remember.

9 Q. (By Mr. Shkolnik) I guess maybe my  
10 question was kind of vague. Let me try to phrase it  
11 this way. Was every reduced order automatically  
12 reported to the DEA?

13 MS. DESH: Objection. Calls for  
14 speculation.

15 Q. (By Mr. Shkolnik) When you became a  
16 member of RX Integrity?

17 MS. DESH: Same objection.

18 A. To the best of my recollection, I believe  
19 it was.

20 Q. (By Mr. Shkolnik) That was not occurring  
21 before RX Integrity came into place; correct?

22 A. I can't speculate to how -- what they were  
23 doing before I came into place.

24 MR. SHKOLNIK: We can go to the next



1 exhibit. That's 68.

2 Q. (By Mr. Shkolnik) I'm going to hand you  
3 Exhibit Number 014. Bates numbers is 00114602.

4 [Exhibit Walgreens-Dymon-014  
5 marked for identification.]

6 Q. This is an e-mail that went out to a large  
7 group on December 7, 2012. Based upon your  
8 recollection of joining the team, would it be fair to  
9 say you would not have been on this distribution? I  
10 know there's a lot of people here.

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. At this time where were you, in December  
13 of 2012?

14 A. Pharmacy manager still.

15 Q. And was the first week of January your  
16 first -- was when you began working in Integrity?

17 A. Yes, about end of first week, start of  
18 second week of January.

19 Q. Did you have to go through an interview  
20 process to be added to the team?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Were they looking for someone who had  
23 store-level experience, a Pharm D, to help come onto  
24 the team?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Had you worked with Tasha Polster before?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. In what capacity?

5 A. When I was a pharmacy intern I worked with  
6 her.

7 Q. What was her position at the time when you  
8 worked with her?

9 A. She was a pharmacy supervisor.

10 Q. When you were saying -- when you did those  
11 sort of -- I think you said it was ridealong or  
12 something along -- you used a phrase earlier.

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. A ridealong --

15 A. Internship.

16 Q. Were you working with -- was that with  
17 Tasha in that capacity?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And when this new team was being  
20 developed, did she reach out to you and say would you  
21 be interested in coming onboard, or did you submit an  
22 application? How did this come about?

23 A. My field leaders recommended the position,  
24 that I look into it, and she also said there's an

1 opportunity on my team if you'd like to look at it and  
2 apply.

3 Q. Had you stayed in contact with Ms. Polster  
4 during the years in between?

5 A. Not really.

6 Q. This is a presentation that occurred on  
7 January 31st, 2013. You were part of -- you were now  
8 part of RX Integrity at that point; correct?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. Did you attend this meeting with Mr.  
11 Bleser and the large group of people when it occurred  
12 in January of 2013?

13 A. No.

14 Q. Did you work under Mr. Bleser at any point  
15 in time?

16 A. No, I did not.

17 MR. SHKOLNIK: If we could jump ahead to  
18 Bates numbered 4613, please.

19 Q. (By Mr. Shkolnik) We have here a slide  
20 that was included in the presentation. And I believe  
21 quite a few members of your, I think, RX Integrity team  
22 were on the distribution, if I'm not mistaken. I think  
23 Ms. Polster was there, and Mr. Merritello, and Mr.  
24 Murray, and I believe Barb Martin. They were all on

1     this distribution.

2                     Did anyone ever tell you about this  
3     quarterly report that was being given when you first  
4     got onto the team?

5             A.     Not that I can recall.

6             Q.     Now, this slide was included in the  
7     presentation, and it refers to -- and the heading is,  
8     and it's under a Walgreens PowerPoint background,  
9     troubling trend in the United States, leading cause of  
10    death is prescription drugs.

11                    Were you aware that by 2011 prescription  
12    drugs was the leading cause of accidental death in the  
13    United States?

14             A.     Just aware of what I heard in the media  
15    around that time.

16             Q.     Did you hear anything in the company about  
17    that when you were joining RX Integrity?

18             A.     Not that I can recall.

19             Q.     Was anyone talking about the fact that DEA  
20    and governmental entities were beginning to look at the  
21    fact that prescription drugs were now passing illegal  
22    drugs, poisons, and car accidents as a number one cause  
23    of death in the United States?

24             A.     Not that I can recall.

1           Q.       From a pharmacy perspective, that's a  
2       significant fact, isn't it, to all of a sudden for the  
3       first time in history prescription drugs are the  
4       leading cause of death in the United States, surpassing  
5       things like car accidents and illegal drugs and  
6       poisonings? Would you agree with that?

7           A.       It's a health care effect, yes.

8           Q.       And this was an early sign of an epidemic  
9       developing in the United States related to prescription  
10      drugs and death; correct?

11          A.       To my personal understanding, yes, that  
12      would be kind of the start of it, yes.

13                 MR. SHKOLNIK: And if we go to the next  
14      slide, 614, please.

15          Q.       (By Mr. Shkolnik) Now, here the teams  
16      were given an outline, which was the evolution of  
17      suspicious order monitoring, with a timeline of events.  
18      And there was testimony by Mr. Bleser that this was  
19      actually prepared by the Pharmacy Integrity group to be  
20      included in the quarterly presentation.

21                 Did anyone ask you for any input into  
22      the -- into a PowerPoint on the timeline of events  
23      regarding suspicious order monitoring?

24          A.       I have may have reviewed or edited, but I

1 can't recall.

2 Q. You worked with Ms. Polster and actually  
3 worked with her on some of the PowerPoints that were  
4 being developed for the team; am I correct?

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. I noticed, looking at a lot of your files,  
7 you were pretty prolific in the PowerPoint area. Were  
8 you -- did she like rely on you in some way to help her  
9 when she was doing her PowerPoint presentations?

10 A. As a reviewer or to assemble graphics and  
11 stuff, yes.

12 Q. So here one of -- the timeline starts with  
13 pre-August of 2010. Were you aware that there was a  
14 steady increase in Florida pill mills and prescribers  
15 dispensing medication? Did you know that that was like  
16 a problem going on down in Florida?

17 A. Not in 2010, no.

18 Q. Did you ever become aware that one of the  
19 problems with respect to the prescription drug deaths  
20 increase was related to increase in Florida pill mills?

21 MS. DESH: Objection to the form.

22 A. Not at that time, no.

23 MR. SHKOLNIK: Before I go through this  
24 whole -- it's going to be a while on this. Let's take

1 a five-minute; okay?

2 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're off the record at  
3 3:39 PM.

4 [A brief recess was taken.]

5 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the  
6 record at 3:56 PM.

7 Q. (By Mr. Shkolnik) Mr. Dymon, the next  
8 milestone on this timeline is October 2010. It says a  
9 change in Florida legislation restricts prescriber  
10 dispensing to only 72-hour supply of pain medication.

11 Is that something you became aware of as a  
12 practicing pharmacist back in those days, that there  
13 were changes being implemented in Florida related to  
14 the prescription of pain medications and doctor  
15 prescriptions?

16 A. No, not at that time.

17 Q. At a later time did you become aware of  
18 that?

19 A. When I was in Integrity.

20 Q. And was this timeline that we're seeing  
21 here something that was discussed ultimately while you  
22 were in Integrity, as it relates to Florida?

23 A. Various timelines where there may have  
24 been something around Florida.

1           Q.     And the next milestone is October 2010 to  
2     March 2010 (sic). There is a dramatic increase in the  
3     number of opioid pain medication prescriptions seen at  
4     retail stores.

5                     Did you become aware of that first while  
6     you were still working in the pharmacy setting?

7           A.     Not that I can recall, no.

8           Q.     When you got into Pharmaceutical  
9     Integrity, did you become aware that, as an industry,  
10    there had been -- that the big chain pharmacy companies  
11    saw a dramatic increase in opioid pain medication  
12    prescriptions that were triggered as a result of  
13    Florida's change in its law regarding dispensing of  
14    pain medication at doctor's offices or pill mills?

15          A.     When I entered into RX Integrity, I became  
16    aware of Florida.

17          Q.     And you then became aware that there was a  
18    problem with what was known as pill mills; am I  
19    correct?

20          A.     Correct, through the media.

21          Q.     And there were pill mills here in the  
22    Chicagoland area, weren't there?

23          A.     There may have been. I'm not aware.

24          Q.     Never heard of any pill mills in this



1 area?

2 A. Not that I can recall.

3 Q. Never heard of it being any type of a  
4 problem that there were pain medication pill mills  
5 popping up even here in Illinois?

6 A. Not that I was aware of.

7 Q. Did the Walgreens stores where you were  
8 working, did they exhibit any increase in opioid sales  
9 over the years you were there?

10 A. Not that I know of.

11 Q. So when you were -- when you were a  
12 floating pharmacist and then you became a manager of  
13 pharmacies, you yourself did not see any escalation of  
14 opioid prescriptions over the years, like a trending  
15 up, between the 2004 time frame and 2011, when you  
16 stopped -- I'm sorry, 2012, when you stopped?

17 A. Not that I can recall.

18 Q. Wasn't it a fact in the industry that  
19 there was a -- in your industry, as a pharmacist,  
20 wasn't it common knowledge that opioids, the filling of  
21 opioid prescriptions and the prescription numbers, were  
22 increasing exponentially over the years from early  
23 2000s up through 2013 or 2012? Wasn't that just  
24 well-known in your industry?

1 MS. DESH: Objection to the form.

2 A. Not to my own personal knowledge or  
3 recollection at that time, no.

4 Q. (By Mr. Shkolnik) You didn't go to any  
5 continuing pharmacy education programs where that was  
6 talked about?

7 A. Not that I can recall.

8 Q. You didn't go to any task force meetings  
9 in your state where this was discussed or anything like  
10 that?

11 A. No, not that I can recall.

12 Q. Were you a member of any organizations  
13 here in your state for pharmacists?

14 A. Not that I -- not at that time that I  
15 remember, no.

16 Q. Did you receive any communications from  
17 any -- from the pharmacy boards of the state of  
18 Illinois talking about increasing prescriptions of  
19 opioids over the last decade, 2000 to 2010, 2012?  
20 Anything from them?

21 A. No, not that I recall.

22 Q. Are you still a licensed pharmacist here  
23 in the state of Illinois?

24 A. Yes, I am.

1 Q. Have you always remained a licensed  
2 pharmacist from the time you first got your license?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Do you receive communications from the  
5 pharmacy board from your state periodically?

6 A. Occasionally, yes.

7 Q. Did -- as you sit here today, is it your  
8 testimony you've received no communications from the  
9 pharmacy board of Illinois related to opioid  
10 prescription and habits of prescriptions?

11 A. To my recollection, I do not recall  
12 receiving any communications around that.

13 Q. Does the pharmacy board sometimes issue  
14 periodic publications to its members?

15 A. I do not know if they issue publications.  
16 They may on their website. I don't go to it or I'm not  
17 a board member or anything like that with the board.

18 Q. No, I'm just saying as a member do you get  
19 communications from the pharmacy board?

20 A. I may get one e-mail a year about license  
21 renewals. That's about it.

22 Q. Are you a member of any societies of  
23 pharmacies or any other type of organizations for  
24 pharmacists?

1 A. No, not at this time.

2 Q. How about prior to 2012?

3 A. I may have been a part of the Illinois  
4 Pharmacists Association at one point, was a member for  
5 a short time, but it may have been around 2014, 2015.  
6 I don't remember.

7 Q. During that time did you receive  
8 communications from the Illinois Pharmacists  
9 Association related to increasing opioid prescriptions?

10 A. Not that I can recall.

11 Q. So in October 2010 to March of 2011 you  
12 did become aware that the pharmacies -- the retail  
13 pharmacies were seeing dramatic increases of opioid  
14 pain medications in the state of Florida? That's  
15 something you did become aware of?

16 A. Not at that time, no.

17 Q. But later?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And then you also became -- later then,  
20 July 2011, Florida prohibited practitioners from  
21 dispensing C-II and C-IIIs except very limited  
22 transactions or instances. You became aware of that  
23 ultimately?

24 A. Correct.

1 Q. And when you were in the Pharmacy  
2 Integrity unit, did this issue come up in terms of  
3 explaining the history of why the DEA was taking action  
4 against Walgreens as well as other pharmacies and  
5 distributors in the United States?

6 A. Yes, in general.

7 Q. And then the next page talks about the  
8 2012 timeline going into 2013. And it says there was  
9 administrative inspection warrants in the six stores  
10 and Jupiter distribution center. We talked about that  
11 earlier, you did become aware of that; correct?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. And then May to June of 2012, eight stores  
14 voluntarily removed all C-II products, Xanax and Soma,  
15 and in that time period the relaunch of good faith  
16 dispensing policy.

17 Does that refresh your recollection as to  
18 when the GFD was relaunched in Walgreens?

19 A. Potentially when I was in the field at  
20 that time, probably, yes.

21 Q. Did you go through the training at that  
22 point in time, the GFD training?

23 A. If it was launched to everyone at the  
24 stores, I would have. I just can't recall or remember

1     how it was done.

2             Q.     If you had gone through the GFD training  
3     module that was released to all the pharmacists and  
4     stores, would that have been something that you would  
5     have done online through like their WalNet or some  
6     other pharmacy -- Walgreens interface?

7             A.     Yes.

8             Q.     Is that something that would have been  
9     kept in your personnel file to show that you actually  
10    completed good faith dispensing training?

11            A.     Potentially either at store level, or I  
12    don't know if it's stored in a database or something  
13    along those lines. I'm not sure.

14            Q.     As you sit here today, do you recall if  
15    you completed any relaunched good faith dispensing  
16    policy training program?

17            A.     I may have. I just can't recall that far  
18    back.

19            Q.     Then it says September 2012 an ISO was  
20    issued for Jupiter distribution center, and in November  
21    an order to show cause was issued for the three Florida  
22    pharmacies.

23                    Were you aware of that when this was  
24    occurring? Did you hear about that through the

1 Walgreens network or through other channels?

2 A. No.

3 Q. Was there word being released by the  
4 company to all the stores, we're having a problem with  
5 our Florida stores and our distribution center, we want  
6 you to be aware of it, we want you to be more in tuned  
7 into your prescription processing with respect to  
8 controlled substances -- anything like that?

9 MS. DESH: Objection to the form.

10 A. Not that I can recall.

11 Q. (By Mr. Shkolnik) Did you have any  
12 understanding as to why the company was relaunching a  
13 good faith dispensing policy right around the time when  
14 they had just been served with inspections and warrants  
15 in Florida?

16 A. I can't recall why they were launched.  
17 They might have evolved the policy over time.

18 Q. So after you joined -- after you joined  
19 Pharmaceutical Integrity, did you reach a conclusion  
20 that the relaunch of good faith dispensing was  
21 unrelated to DEA action, that this was just Walgreens  
22 looking to be a good pharmacy? Is that your  
23 understanding?

24 A. My understanding is the policy evolved

**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**







**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**





**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**



**REDACTED**

